

---

**REMARKS**

Applicant has filed amended claims 28-47 to better encompass the full scope and breadth of the invention notwithstanding Applicant's belief that the claims would have been allowable as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that no claims have been narrowed within the meaning of *Festo*.

**I. Rejection of Claims 8-22 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Broadhurst**

Claims 8-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Broadhurst (Reference A) U.S. Patent 6,560,634. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Examiner uses Reference A (Abstract, Col. 4, lines 10-22, col. 6, lines 15-26, and col. 7 lines 9-26) to show how Broadhurst teaches a method for determining the unavailability of a domain name. Broadhurst discloses how an improved query server or domain name search engine can be used to perform of multitude of searches simultaneously to search for domain name records in the public DNS.

Though Broadhurst specifies a query server with respect to improving domain name related searching in the DNS, *Broadhurst does not in any way teach or suggest a relationship or combination regarding performing such domain name requests while performing Internet search engine requests for Internet content, and vice-versa.*

*Applicant teaches how separate network services can be unified and integrated to provide a completely new service. For instance, Internet search engine results can be augmented by including domain name related information as part of Internet search engine results. Likewise domain name availability reports can be augmented by including search engine result information as part of such availability reports.*

All claims have been rewritten to define patentably over Broadhurst and other references, alone or in combination. For instance, the second recited element of independent Claim 28, "performing an internet content search in accordance with said internet search engine request", is in no way taught or suggested in Broadhurst. Similarly, the last recited element of independent Claim 28, "determining whether said at least one domain name is available for registration either one of a before, during, and after presenting said at least one search result from said internet content search", clearly distinguishes over prior art by showing that separate services such as domain name registration and searching internet content can be integrated into a combined result.

In turn, independent Claims 38 and 44 are similar in scope to claim 28 and are in no way shape or form suggested, taught, or even mentioned in these references under the same rationale.

Furthermore, dependent Claims 29-37, inclusive, incorporate all the subject matter of Claim 28 and add additional subject matter, which makes them, a fortiori, independently patentable over these references.

**II. Dutta teaches a method and system for augmenting web-indexed search engine results with peer-to-peer search results**

Though Dutta, et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,636,854 filed 12/7/2000 is not considered prior art, Dutta shows that rather than relying solely on an index search in a database that has only indexed a minor portion of the entire World Wide Web, a server-based, peer-to-peer search is initiated in conjunction with the index search. The results from both search processes can be combined so that the user receives an augmented search result with more information than a search result from either process by itself.

*Similarly, Applicant teaches how Internet search engine results can be augmented by including additional information related to each search result.* Unlike Dutta, such additional information does not include peer-to-peer search results but rather can include information such as WHOIS information, geographical location information, page source information, domain name after market status information, sitemap information, and the like.

**III. Notice of References Cited, PTO-892**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the references cited but not applied. Applicant respectfully submits that none of those references, alone or in any combination, remedy the deficiencies of the applied art, nor teach or suggest the claimed invention alone or in any combination.

**IV. Conclusion**


For all of the above reasons, the present application and pending claims 28-47, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a formal Notice of Allowance directed to claims 28-47, inclusive.

**V. Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance**

If, for any reason the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP §707.07(j) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without need for further proceedings.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



December 24, 2003

---

Eric Schneider  
*pro se* Applicant

13938A Cedar Road #258  
University Heights, Ohio 44118

(216) 231-2400 - telephone